DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 283 TM 840 640

TITLE	A Study of Current Instruments Which Measure Vocational Aptitudes and Interests of Students.
INSTITUTION	Alabama State Dept. of Education, Montgomery.
PUB DATE	Jul 83
NOTE	72p.; Small print in some tables and some appendices. Prepared by the Division of Vocational Education Services and the Division of Audits and Management.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Aptitude Tests; Feasibility Studies; Junior High Schools; School Districts; *School Policy; *Statewide Planning; Student Attitudes; *Vocational Aptitude; Vocational Education; *Vocational Interests
IDENTIFIERS	*Alabama

ABSTRACT

A compelling case has been made for improving the process of admissions, selection, and enrollment of students in vocational education programs. A key element in this improvement would be the adoption of a statewide assessment of vocational aptitudes and interests of ninth-grade students in Alabama as a measure of student career development and future program planning. A pilot assessment project affecting 2,600 students in 26 school systems of the state resulted in the identification of several appropriate interest surveys and aptitude measures feasible for statewide adoption. This report presents results of the Pilot Assessment Project of the Alabama Vocational Assessment Plan. It sets forth rationale and recommendations for the statewide assessment of vocational interests and aptitudes of ninth-grade students in Alabama schools. (Author/BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249283

A STUDY OF CURRENT INSTRUMENTS WHICH MEASURE VOCATIONAL APTITUDES AND INTERESTS OF STUDENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Teague

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by
The Division of Vocational Education Services
in coordination with
The Division of Audits and Management

The State of Alabama Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama

July 1983

TM 840 040

CONTENTS

Introduction.....ii

Part I, Significance and Rationale.....1

Part II, Development and Methodology.....5
Cost.....8
Pilot Testing.....9
Turn-Around Scoring Quality.....10

Part III, Pilot Results.....13
Aptitude and Interest Pilot Assessment Results.....13
Reactions to Instruments.....13
Test Administrators' Reactions.....15
LEA Reactions Follow-Up Workshop.....21
Conclusions.....21

Part IV, Recommendations.....23
Implementation.....24

Appendix.....25

Bibliography.....65

INTRODUCTION

The State Board of Education, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education and research reports make a compelling case for the State Department of Education to improve the process of admissions, selection and enrollment of students in vocational education programs. A key element in this improvement would be the adoption of a statewide assessment of vocational aptitudes and interests of ninth-grade students in Alabama as a measure of student career development and future program planning.

A pilot assessment project affecting 2,600 students in twenty-six school systems of the State resulted in the identification of several appropriate interest surveys and aptitude measures feasible for statewide adoption.

This report presents results of the Pilot Assessment Project of the Alabama Vocational Assessment Plan. This report sets forth rationale and recommendations for the statewide assessment of vocational interests and aptitudes of ninth-grade students in Alabama schools. The report discusses the project under the following topics: Part I, Significance and Rationale; Part II, Development and Methodology; Part III, Pilot Results; Part IV, Recommendations; and Part V, Appendix.

PART I
SIGNIFICANCE AND RATIONALE

The State of Alabama is currently enrolling sixty-seven percent of her high school students in vocational education courses. Data for the school year 1981-82 show that 109,717 students in grades ten, eleven and twelve enrolled in vocational education programs. (VEDS Follow-up Activities, 1982) In light of this investment in vocational education, it is essential that the State have policy and practices regarding the admissions, selection and enrollment of students into vocational education courses.

The Division of Vocational Education Services made this study of current instruments which measure vocational aptitudes and interests of students for the following reasons:

1. The State Board of Education states that,

> *"Valid testing instruments and other guidance activities shall be used to assist students in identifying their vocational interests, aptitudes, and abilities in selecting appropriate occupational preparation programs prior to enrollment." - Alabama Vocational Education Standards and Policies, 1981.*

2. The State Advisory Council for Vocational advises that,

> *"V. Testing/Vocational Guidance*
> *The Council has made the majority of its recommendations since 1971 in the area of planning. The second most frequent area of concern, however, has been in vocational*

guidance and counseling. Credentialling programming, job descriptions, provisions of occupational information, or testing has been addressed in almost every Annual Evaluation Report.

> *'The State Board of Education should include in its State-wide testing program a standardized vocational interest inventory...'*

This recommendation was made in 1976 and again in 1977. The Council wishes to repeat it this year, 1983. Not only is such an effort necessary to assist students to identify those vocational areas which may be the most appropriate, but also to assist the local vocational community to add/delete or otherwise adjust their vocational program, as well as the regular curriculum, to meet the needs of students in a more efficient manner.

> *The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education recommends that the State Board of Education include in its State-wide testing program both in junior high school and later a standardized vocational interest inventory/aptitude test. The instrument should provide the capability of converting or assorting vocational interest areas, vocational instructional programs and occupational titles. Results of such tests should also be used as an integral part of the planning process both for secondary program selection." - Alabama Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1982, p. 24-25.*

3. The results of vocational education program reviews conducted during 1981-82 in thirty school systems in 1981-82 reported the following:

"STUDENT SERVICES

Number of Times Cited	*% of Reports*
27	*90%*

Description

COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE SERVICES NOT AVAILABLE TO ALL VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

- *little coordination between schools*
- *standardized interest/aptitude tests not used, or if used, not always interpreted to student*

- role of 'vocational counselor' not understood by other counselors
- need more full-time counselors
- need complete job descriptions for counselors
- a 'guidance plan' may exist, but is not published or followed
- students enroll in vocational programs with no occupational objective in mind" - Alabama Accountability Report for Vocational Education, 1982.

4. Results of Evaluation Through Program Improvement Monitoring Conducted During 1981-82 reported the following"

"'Student Services' ranked the same as last year and was the least successful area of program improvement. This area continues to make less progress toward satisfactory status with all of the components meeting an average of forty-three percent (43%) successful response to recommendations made in the summary reports. Orientation (75%): Recommendations relating to the orientation or informing of students about the total vocational program reviewed satisfactory responses in seventy-five percent of the systems monitored. ... Placement into programs (28%): Recommendations written to improve the placement of students into appropriate vocational curriculum areas created little improvement with only twenty-eight percent of systems receiving satisfactory reports." - Alabama Accountability Report for Vocational Education, 1982.

5. Vocational Guidance Services conducted a survey of superintendents, vocational directors and vocational counselors in 1982. The questionnaire asked what kinds of vocational interest/aptitudes instruments were being used; at which grade levels; and whether schools had written policies or procedures in the areas of admissions into programs, student selection of programs and registration (i.e., enrollment) into classes.

"Of 146 surveys returned, respondents indicated that:

- *43% of the schools did not use any standardized aptitudes or interest instruments, or only with selected students*
- *only 38% of the schools have written policies for admitting students into vocational education programs*
- *only 27% have written policies for student selection of vocational programs*
- *only 22% have written policies for registration for vocational classes*
- *of those schools which use vocational aptitude/interest measures, 50% are used in the ninth grade.*

In addition, the survey revealed a wide variety of instruments being given students." - Vocational Guidance Survey, 1982.

The same survey showed approximately fifty different kinds of instruments being used by local schools to assess interest, aptitudes and special needs of students.

In summary, the background and rationale for this study point to the need for an immediate improvement in the vocational aptitude/interest assessment of students in our schools consistent with the intent of the State Board of Education Policy.

PART II
DEVELOPMENT AND METHODOLOGY

The report next raises two questions; First, "How can the State develop an effective assessment program for the vocational interests and aptitudes of students?"; and second, "How can the vocational assessment program improve local policies and procedures for student admissions, selection and enrollment into programs?"

In order to meet the needs for a vocational assesssment program, Dr. Robert T. Carter in 1982 directed that the Vocational Education Services Division begin a systematic investigation of current practices and instruments in the vocational assessment field. The goals for the study were stated as the following:

1. To provide a systematic vocational assessment plan for determining the assessment of student interests, aptitudes and abilities for all students in Alabama in grade nine by 1984.
2. To insure that the assessment instrument(s) selected and other pre-enrollment guidance activities are planned and implemented in accordance with standards designed to support sound vocational choice and decision making.

3. To provide a systematic procedures for local and state evaluation of the proposed vocational assessment instruments, including a measure of impact on student decision making.

To achieve these goals, the Division committed itself to the following research and development time lines.

ALABAMA VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN
DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION
TIME LINE

B. Hayes, I. Rockhill, D. Patterson, A. Smith, S. Shippen, F. Johnson*

August 30-31, 1982	Call S.D.E. Task Force consultants together and develop plan of action -- Shippen, Hayes
September 13, 1982	Form Ad Hoc Committee of State Advisory Committee on Vocational Guidance Assessment Project -- Shippen, Hayes
October 18-22, 1982	Introduce topic at Regional Conferences Obtain feedback by survey
November, 1982 by 20th	Task Force and Committee specify criteria for selection of pilot testing sites Test Companies make presentations to S.D.E., subject: pilot testing
December 1982	Develop outline and procedures for site selection, pilot testing, results determination
January 1983	Select sites for pilot testing
February 1983	Supply sites with assessment materials
March 1983	Conduct and monitor site testing
April 1983	Provide assistance to sites for evaluation
May 1983	Develop report procedure and recommendations
June 1983	Finalize recommendations
July 1983	Draft final report to State Superintendent of Education
August 1983	Follow up at sites
September - December 1983	Finalize plan for full implementation in 1984

*Floyd Johnson, Jr., Division of Audits and Management

The Division of Vocational Education Services contacted companies which produce and sell assessment instruments and invited the companies to present their tests for review by a State Department of Education screening committee. Screening and rating criteria used by the committee were the following.

- o relative cost factors to outcomes
- o relative time and usability factors to school personnel
- o relative reliability and validity factors to career decision making
- o relative compatibility to existing school testing programs
- o relative program evaluation factors to program success
- o pilot testing and evaluation of selected instruments to meet above criteria

In all, twenty-six companies were contacted. Some companies did not respond, and some companies decided not to engage in the screening process.

However, twelve companies did respond to the invitation to present instruments to the screening committee. During the week of December 13-17, 1982, company representatives presented information on their instruments in two-hour time schedules. Each company was permitted two hours of presentation time per instrument to the committee. Altogether, the committee reviewed and rated twenty instruments.

Fourteen members of the State Department of Education carried out the work of the screening committee. The committee rating instruments and rank order of results are presented in Appendix A of the report.

At a committee meeting on January 10, 1983, using data available from the screening and review process, the committee decided to request the following instruments for pilot testing:

1. Interest Inventories:
   - o Ohio Vocational Interest Survey (OVIS)
   - o Career Occupational Preference Survey (COPS)
   - o System for Assessment and Group Evaluation (SAGE)
2. Aptitudes Measures:
   - o System for Assessment and Group Evaluation (SAGE)
   - o Career Aptitude Preference Survey (CAPS)
   - o Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB)

Cost:

In addition to other criteria, the screening committee also considered the instruments from the standpoint of cost to the State. Using figures supplied by the companies, in December 1982, the following costs are projected.

- First Year Costs -

Based on a test run of 50,000 students located in 462 school sites in the State, the acquisition costs for the instruments, including

machine scoring of results is as follows:

Instruments	Projected Costs
Aptitude	
*ASVAB	$ -0-
CAPS	63,500.00
SAGE Aptitude	251,250.00
Interest Inventories	
COPS	$ 92,500.00
OVIS	103,376.50
SAGE Interest	87,500.00

*The Department of Defense will not charge the State of Alabama for the use or scoring of the ASVAB.

Pilot Testing:

The committee decided to select a random sample of students, up to 500 per instrument, and pilot test the instruments under actual school conditions in April 1983. Using a table of random numbers and maintaining full class participation based on number of students enrolled, the Research Coordinating Unit selected twenty-six school sites for the pilot assessment project. These sites and the numbers of students assessed appear in Appendix B of the report.

During the week of March 21-25, company representatives trained and oriented local test administrators and State Department of Education personnel assigned to work at individual sites on the proper use of the pilot instruments. Company representatives conducted the training sessions and paid the travel and per diem costs of the participants. It is estimated that each company invested $2,700 in the cost of the pilot testing of its instrument(s).

The Research Coordinating Unit developed evaluation criteria to determine reactions to the pilot instruments.

These measures are included in Appendix C. The measures were designed to record reaction of the test administrators, students, and test interpreters to the pilot instruments. Since *turn-around time* was considered to be an important variable in determining the capability of the company in providing machine-scored test results, records were maintained on this variable.

During the week of April 18-22, 1983, approximately 2,600 students participated in the pilot assessment project. In addition to local personnel, a State Department of Education specialist assisted each school site. Data were collected for the evaluation of each pilot site and are presented in the following section of the report.

Turn-Around Time Scoring Quality:

As mentioned previously, *turn-around* for scoring purposes is an important variable, as is the quality of the scoring reports. A company which fails to meet *turn-around time*, or whose scoring reports are of inferior quality loses ground in the judgment of the committee.

The following table indicates actual turn-around times for the instruments in the pilot program.

Turn-Around Time Record
Pilot Assessment Project

Instrument	Date Tests Mailed to Test Company from SDE	Date Scores Received from Test Company at SDE	Elapsed Time
COPS	4/22/83	5/5/83	13 days
CAPS	4/22/83	5/5/83	13 days
ASVAB	4/28/83	5/4/83	6 days
OVIS*	4/22/83	5/17/83	25 days*
SAGE Aptitude	4/27/83	5/20/83	23 days
SAGE Interest	4/27/83	5/24/83	27 days

*Letter concerning time elapsed found in Appendix D.

The variable of scoring report quality and scope may be considered from two aspects: 1) Are the scoring reports readable and understandable?; and 2) Are the scoring reports summative so that one can make comparisons on the basis of scores by grade, school, system and state as a whole?

In the judgment of the participating pilot test administrators, COPS, CAPS, ASVAB and OVIS met these criteria. In the judgment of the pilot test administrators, SAGE Aptitude and SAGE Interest Inventory failed to provide scoring reports that were readable and understandable for test interpretation.

These findings came to light at a special follow-up conference of pilot test administrators and State Department of Education personnel on June 21-22, 1983. The findings of this conference are included in the next section of the report entitled Pilot Results.

Summative data available for comparison by grade, school, system and state came from the OVIS pilot. Since these type of data were not specifically required as part of the pilot project, subsequent follow-up contacts were made with companies to determine whether such summative data could be made available. These aspects are still under investigation, but preliminary information is found in Appendix E of the report.

The State Department of Education developed a pilot assessment project in order to achieve the goal of finding vocational assessment instruments suitable for the statewide assessment of the vocational aptitudes and interests of ninth-grade students in Alabama. The steps in this process are

outlined as follows.

1. The Division of Vocational Education Services in collaboration with the Division of Audits and Management formed a committee of SDE specialists to screen and evaluate currently used aptitudes and interest measures.
2. The committee contacted major test publishers and invited them to submit instruments for consideration.
3. After reviewing twenty instruments the committee selected six instruments and conducted a pilot study to measure the efficiency of the instruments under statewide assessment conditions.

The following section of this report presents the results of the Pilot Assessment Project.

PART III
PILOT RESULTS

Aptitude and Interest Pilot Assessment Results:

The Research Coordinating Unit developed three evaluation instruments to obtain reactions to the feasibility of the three interest surveys and three aptitude tests used in the pilot assessment project. Reaction instruments were developed for students, test administrators and test interpretors. The assumption was made that all survey and tests would measure, at an acceptable level, either aptitude or interest.

The following information will be limited to the results of two of the three reaction instruments developed. As mentioned earlier in the report, the turn-around time on three of the instruments extended approximately 25 days. Because of this delay in returning information to the respective school system, the results could not be interpreted to the students before school dismissed for the year. It was decided that reactions by the test interpretors would not be analyzed until all had responded.

Reactions to Instruments:

The usable data collected was subjected to analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Dr. Richard Baker* consulted with the RCU staff, and all

computer analyses were performed at Auburn.

Student Reaction to Interest Surveys

The student reactions to the three interest surveys were analyzed using the CHI Square, ANOVA and Scheffe procedures from the SPSS package. No significant difference was determined based on the data collected.[1] Although two CHI Square values were derived at the .05 level, the Scheffe procedure indicated no significant difference between the reaction to three surveys. (Also, see Appendix C for scattergram.)

Student Reaction to Aptitude Instruments

The same analytical procedures were applied to the student reactions to the three aptitude tests. Three reaction items, as measured by the RCU evaluation instrument, derived significant differences. Although all CHI Square Values indicated significant differences on all items reacted to by the students, only three were distinguishable as to where the significants existed. On responses to Question 2, *"Did you understand the wording in the question?"*, a significant difference was found between CAPS and SAGE and between SAGE and ASVAB. The same distinguishable significant difference also appeared in reaction to Question 4, *"How many questions did you not understand?"* The only other distinguishable significant difference appeared in the student reactions to Question 5, *"Do you think this test will help you in*

---

*Department Head
Vocational and Adult Education, Auburn University.

[1]Chart A, page 17.

choosing high school courses?" These differences were between CAPS and SAGE and between CAPS and ASVAB. No other discernible significant differences were made.[2] (See Appendix C for scattergram.)

Test Administrators' Reactions:

CHI Square analysis was the only procedure from the SPSS package used on seven of the eight reactions to RCU test administrators evaluation instrument. ANOVA was applied to reactions in Question 2. Because of limited number of respondents, in some cases three (N=3), the results and interpretations thus are questionable.

Interest Survey-Test Administrator

Significant CHI Values were derived on two responses only: Question 4, *"Do you believe the student understood the questions?"*, and Question 7, *"How easy was the test to administer?"* Because of the small (N) numbers of cases of usable reactions, it would be unwise to draw conclusions from these results except to say that the significant CHI Square Values may be indicative of the sample size.[3] Question 2 may, however, lend information concerning the time resources of LEAs in using the different instruments. Chart D displays the mean ($\bar{x}$) time expended in training, practice, preparation and administering the various instruments.

For the three interest surveys, visual observation indicates little difference in total preparation time by the

[2]Chart B, page 18.
[3]Chart C, page 19.

LEA staff, although some individual difference occurred between training, practice, preparation and administration. COPS has only a slightly lower mean ($\bar{x}$) number of students per mean ($\bar{x}$) time of administration.[4]

Aptitude - Test Administrator Reaction

Significant CHI Values were derived in responses 1 and 3 - 7. Again, caution should be taken in drawing conclusions because of the small number of cases; however, there did appear to be significant differences in the reactions to the various aptitude measures.

The total time for training, practice, preparation, and administration were significantly different, with SAGE aptitude requiring the most total time of 50 hours and 28 minutes, followed by ASVAB with 11 hours and 40 minutes, and finally CAPS with 6 hours.

The crucial time factor, however, is the amount of time a student is taken out of the school day to administer the test. Again, SAGE required the largest number of hours with a mean ($\bar{x}$) of 24 hours; followed by ASVAB, 2 hours and 24 minutes; and lowest, CAPS with 1 hour and 6 minutes. In looking at the mean ($\bar{x}$) number of students per mean ($\bar{x}$) number of hours of administration, the three instruments differed significantly by observation: Chart D -- SAGE Aptitude with 4.94 mean ($\bar{x}$) student per mean ($\bar{x}$) hours of administration; ASVAB with 18.41 mean ($\bar{x}$) students per mean ($\bar{x}$) hour as compared with CAPS, 42.9. Clearly, the least time consuming of the three aptitude measures was CAPS.

[4]Chart D, page 20.

CHART A

VARIANCE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT REPONSES FOR VOCATIONAL INTEREST INVENTORIES, ALABAMA 1983

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSE	Mean Reponse SCORES 1 COPS N=409	SAGE N=483	OVIS N=476	Chi Square Value 2 (Raw Scores Distribution)	F Ratio (ANOVA)	Scheffe Procedure Pairs of Groups Significantly Different at .05 Level
1. Instructions clear and helpful	1.308	1.667	1.618	2.50741	.766	4
2. Wording of questions understandable	1.623	1.768	1.924	.91251	.691	4
3. Difficulty answering questions	1.594	1.625	1.813	20.02274*	.443	4
4. Number of questions not understood	2.509	1.810	1.977	4.93026	1.643	4
5. Test helpful to you in course selection	2.528	2.282	1.96	2.92421	1.683	4
6. Test helpful to others in course selection	3.136 (N=294)	2.662 (N=473)	2.36 (N=326)	15.53237*	.787	4

1. Scores based on a rating 1-4 Likert-type scale. See page for instrument and description
2. Significant at the .05 level denoted by *
3. Differences denoted by coding 1 COPS and SAGE, 2 COPS and OVIS, 3 SAGE and OVIS, and 4 no two test are significantly different.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHART B

VARIANCE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSES FOR VOCATIONAL APITITUDE SURVEYS, ALABAMA 1983

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSE	CAPS N=413	SAGE N=320	ASVAB N=418	Chi Square Value 2 (Raw Scores Distribution)	F Ratio (ANOVA)	Scheffe Procedure Pairs of Groups Significantly Different at .05 level
1. Instructions clear and helpful	1.947	1.428	1.813	22.01379*	1.485	4
2. Wording of questions understandable	2.826	1.856	2.722	122.39091*	11.143	1 & 3
3. Difficulty answering questions	2.644	2.131	3.079	125.84309*	2.462	4
4. Number of questions not understood	2.692	1.997	2.667	113.72066*	6.219	1 & 3
5. Test helpful to you in course selection	3.109	2.287	2.39	27.18855*	4.577	1 & 2
6. Test helpful to others in course selection	Contaminated Data	2.791 (N=258)	2.649 (N=239)	41.42125*	2.025	4

1. Scores based on a rating 1-4 Likert-type scale. See page _____ for instrument and description
2. Significant at the .05 level denoted by *
3. Differences denoted by coding 1 CAPS and SAGE, 2 CAPS and ASVAB, 3 SAGE and ASVAB and 4 No two test are significantly different.

CHART C

ANALYSIS OF TEST ADMINISTRATORS RESPONSES
VOCATIONAL INTEREST AND APTITUDE, ALABAMA 1983

	Chi Square Value			Chi Square Value		
	COPS (N=10)	SAGE INT. (N=5)	OVIS (N=7)	CAPS (N=5)	SAGE APT. (N=3)	ASVAB (N=5)
1. How difficult was it for you to learn to give this test?		2.507			22.013*	
3. Were you comfortable with the directions and information you were able to give students?		.912			122.390*	
4. Do you believe the students understood the questions?		20.022*			125.84*	
5. The number of students to whom you could administer the test at one time was?		4.930			113.720*	
6. Is this test feasible for use in your local school system as administered in the pilot?		2.924			27.188*	
7. How easy was this test to administer?		15.53*			41.42*	
8. Was it difficult to distribute, collect and package these materials?	Insufficient Data					

*Significate difference at .05 level with 2 degrees of freedom

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHART D

VARIANCE ANALYSIS OF TEST ADMINISTRATOR'S RESPONSES FOR QUESTION 2** VOCATIONAL SURVEYS, ALABAMA 1983

		TRAIN (x hrs.)	PRACTICE (x hrs.)	PREPARATION (x hrs.)	ADMINISTERING (x hrs.)	NOS** (x hrs.)	NOs./(x) hrs. of adm.
CAPS	N=10	3 hrs. 6 mins.	45 mins.	1 hr. 6 mins.	1 hr. 6 mins.	47.2	42.9
COPS	N=5	2 hrs. 36 mins.	12 mins.	36 mins.	3 hrs. 2 mins.	82.6	25.8
SAGE INT.	N=5	5 hrs. 36 mins.	1 hr. 24 mins.	1 hr. 36 mins.	2 hrs. 36 mins.	99.8	38.3
SAGE APT.	N=3	9 hrs. 19 mins.	2 hrs. 19 mins.	5 hrs. 40 mins.	24 hrs.	118.6	4.94
OVIS	N=7	11 hrs. 34 mins.	1 hr. 43 mins	51 mins.	1 hr. 43 mins	57.2	33.40
ASVAB	N=5	6 hrs. 36 mins.	48 mins.	2 hrs.	2 hrs. 24 mins.	44.2	18.41

*NOS mean number of students tested during the mean hours of administration

**Hours spent in training, practice, preparing materials for testing, and administration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEA Reactions Follow-up Workshop:

Reactions made at the follow-up meeting of LEAs who participated in the pilot were varied. Overall, most expressed a favorable reaction to using interest surveys and aptitude measures to assist students with planning. Each group recorded a number of strengths and weaknesses to each of the instruments used in the pilot. The reactions are included on page of Appendix C.

The reaction did not overwhelmingly favor any interest survey or aptitude instrument. Of the three interest surveys, OVIS and SAGE Interest and Aptitude were again sighted for the lengthy turn-around time and SAGE Aptitude for total time.

Reactions to the aptitude instruments again did not indicate a strong preference to any one instrument; however, CAPS seems to have received more favorable reactions primarily because of the smaller time requirement in preparation and administration and the "useful and helpful information" returned to the LEA.

Conclusions:

A strong case can be made for the needed use of interest surveys and aptitude instruments to assist students in planning their education based on the pilot and other information presented in the report. However, no strong recommendation can be made as a result of the pilot test for ranking any one of the interest surveys or aptitude instruments as superior to the others. The student data collected in some cases was

contaminated to the extent of not being usable. The limited number of reactions by the test administrators severely weakens analysis of their reactions.

Further study is needed: 1) to determine the effectiveness of the instruments used in students making choices and planning their educational experiences; 2) to determine and analyze reactions to all instruments by the test interpretors; 3) to review research studies, especially longitudinal studies, completed in other states.

PART IV
RECOMMENDATIONS

As has been noted earlier in this report, sixty-seven percent of the students in Alabama in grades ten, eleven and twelve are enrolled in vocational education courses. Measures of vocational interest and aptitude are not being used to assist these students in making an important educational decision. In those schools where an effort is being made to provide standardized instruments, a wide variety, one might even say a "hodge-podge", of tests are being used. This situation needs to be corrected through leadership and financial support from the state level.

This report will make two major recommendations to the State Superintendent of Education.

1. The State Department of Education adopt and seek funding for a vocational aptitude and interest measure for all ninth-grade students for implementation in 1984.
2. The State Department of Education provide all local school systems with a model set of guidelines and recommendations for improved policies and practices of admissions, selection and enrollment into vocational education programs.

Implementation:

The following specific recommendations are made in order to implement the general recommendations:

1. The State Department of Education appoint a committee to review pilot assessment data on aptitude and interest measures, and make recommendations for selection of instruments.
2. The State Superintendent name a task force to develop and disseminate a model set of guidelines for improved policies and practices of student admissions, selection and enrollment into vocational education programs.
3. The State Department of Education include an assessment of vocational aptitudes and interests as part of the state testing program for the school year 1984-85.
4. The State Superintendent make provisions for the State Department of Education to conduct evaluations, based on student follow up, to determine the effectiveness of the vocational assessment program in Alabama schools.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Page

A. Minutes of Vocational Guidance and Counseling Assessment Committee meeting on January 10, 1983.....27
Rating Form for Ability/Adaptability Assessment.....30
Rating Form for Interest Inventory.....32
Review Panel Ratings of Interest Inventories.....34
Rank Order of Review Panel Rating Totals on Interest Inventories.....35
Rank Order of Costs for Interest Inventories.....36
Review Panel Ratings of Aptitude Measures.....37
Rank Order of Review Panel Rating Totals on Aptitude Measures.....38
Rank Order of Costs for Aptitude Measures.....39

B. Pilot Assessment Project.....40

C. Student Reaction Form.....42
Test Interpretor.....43
Test Administrator.....44
Scattergram of Reaction to Interest Surveys by Students...45
Scattergram of Reaction to Aptitude Surveys by Students...46
Recorded Reactions at LEA Follow-up Conference.....47

D. "Turn-Around Time" Report.....54

E. Summative Reports.....56

Appendix A

MINUTES

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
882 State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama
January 10, 1983

Members Present: Mr. Floyd Johnson, Miss Kay Johnson, Mr. Ralph Johnson, Mrs. Anita Barber, Mr. Bennie Hayes, Mr. Troy Newton, Mr. Henry Wright, Dr. Douglas Patterson, Dr. Mary Louise Simms, Dr. Bob Kimbrell, Mr. Tom Pierce, Dr. Sam Shippen

Mr. Bennie Hayes gave the invocation.

Dr. Shippen chaired the meeting. He brought samples of the tests that have been looked at as a refresher for the committee. He said he and Mr. Hayes had taken all the data sheets turned in by the committee and complied them. The purpose of this meeting today is to come to a determine which instruments we want to use for piloting in the state so we can notify these companies as soon as possible.

Mr. Hayes handed out copies of a sample of GATB results used in a school of 1550 first year students. He pointed out that this is a very limited basis to claim any predicted validity; however, it looks pretty successful. These are students that took the GATB before they enrolled in the vocational program. He explained the test to the committee.

Dr. Shippen passed out copies of the interest inventory and aptitude measures. He explained that there are two instruments the committee looked at that are not on this listing - GATB and ASVAB. The nature of these two instruments are quite different from the others. He then passed out the results of the tabluations of the sheets the committee filled out. He explained to the committee the way the results were tabluated. Cost data was projected. We took five ~~SMSA~~ vocational regions in the state and estimated the number of students would be 10,000 per region, or 50,000 total. We are going to deal with units of 10,000. The cost data was figured on interest and aptitude. (Samples attached)

Mr. Wright pointed out that some tests are doing both aptitude and interest and if you are trying to to do both it might cost more if you try to use more than one company.

The committee discussed the factor of cost at length.

Mr. Wright said he did not think the committee had any choice but to use ASVAB. The main thing is to see that it is properly used.

Mr. Newton said he thought by going by the ASVAB in the 9th grade it could not be bad.

Mr. Ralph Johnson pointed out it would save the State about $50,000,000.

Dr. Simms said that as of now the military is involved in Washington with her office and they are extremely interested in working with us and getting over the stigma that hangs over them and having it as an accepted valid test.

Mrs. Barber asked if the military has provided us with follow-up information of these tests.

Mr. Newton said they stated they would be willing to mold their follow-up to fit what we desire.

Dr. Patterson stated that the validity flow is not good and that no matter how cheap it is, if it is not doing anything it is no good.

Mr. Wright stated he did not think it was being used properly now.

Mr. Floyd Johnson asked if social security numbers would be used on these tests. There was a sample of the test in the ASVAB booklet and the 11th grade tests did ask for social security numbers.

Mr. Ralph Johnson said in their presentation they said the first thing they are concerned with is taking the stigma out and the second thing is for the 11th grade it will be used for recruiting purposes.

Mr. Hayes said the 11th grade testing is optional for the schools. He said that the armes services view this as a long term investment. Ninth grade does not give them any immediate results but in the long run it gives them this P.R. with the schools. He said the thought the big thing would be the validity of it and also that they would have to do a lot of cross reference.

Mr. Ralph Johnson said that whether we go with them or not they are going to be out there trying to get their tests given.

Mr. Hayes asked Floyd Johnson what his opinion was as to what the counselors attitudes might be toward ASVAB.

Mr. Johnson said that the counselors have been free of the burden of giving these tests. The armed services have brought people in to give these. He said he was not sure it was administered properly. He said he thought it was as good an aptitude test as you can find on the market, but we have a lot of things to look at. The way they got into the schools to begin with was about 10 years ago they got the superintendent's approval to pilot test. You would have to get approval from the State Board, etc.

Mr. Newton pointed out that we use military as one of our placement areas in vocational education. In giving this test in the ninth grade we want to keep the recruiters out of the schools. When they come a lot of the students feel cornered into taking the test.

Mr. Johnson said the counselors would not greet this with open arms but he thought it was something they would learn to accept.

Dr. Shippen said GATB was the other instrument we looked at that is in a category by itself. It does cost. It looks like for a unit of testing one school and approximately 150 students the cost would be about $550. The interesting thing about GATB is there are about 128 centers licensed to give the GATB in the state already. To get ~~licensed~~ certified you have to take training at the University of Alabama and then be approved by the State. He said he would consider this a controlled test. As a matter of fact, Alabama probably has the largest number of administrators in the nation. The company has certain questions in their minds as to how valid these tests are since many of the administrators have not had training in the new tests.

Mr. Wright pointed out that the company said they were not sure they could get an agreement for us to use the tests in all schools in the state. Another fact is they don't have the personnel to police the systems and if they did they could close the center down. GATB is a good test but I don't think we could overcome all the obstacles with it.

Mrs. Barber said that trying to overcome all the obstacles might be more than the committee could tackle right now. It would take several years.

Dr. Shippen stated that he felt like this committee had done as much work as any committee has ever done on assessing these instruments. He said he felt that we should not try to try to pilot more than four instruments. We are not interested so much in norming the tests but rather we are trying to find out if these instruments are what they report to be in a local setting and if the teachers and counselors will use it and be satisfied with the end follow-up with the students in the field to review. Therefore, I see us selecting probably four instruments, going in and measuring them with 550-600 students and giving them this instrument, then do a measure as to how satisfied they were in the local system, and then come back and look to the students tested and find out from them if this made any difference in their choice.

Mr. Wright asked if the committee needed to give consideration to maybe a paper and pencil test for low interest groups along with other tests for the general student population. Isn't the ultimate goal to come up with a board resolution to cover testing?

Mr. Hayes said he didn't think any one test was going to do for the total student population. How much is going to be used for total ponulation? How much is for special needs students?

Dr. Shippen said the decision we are trying to make has applicability to a committee that we will get together in the fall and provide them with information they will get to make a good recommendation to their policy. We need to decide what we need to do to help them make a decision. We owe these people that much. He then asked the committee to vote on the number of instruments to be pilot tested for aptitude and the number for interest. The result of this vote was a tie - 7 for 2, and 7 for 3. The committee members discussed and generally agreed to pilot test 3 instruments.

Mr. Hayes said that he thought the consensus of the group was that we want to do something with ASVAB and I think I am prejudice toward GATB. I would like to get some data comparative to the pilot on the GATB for the committee.

Dr. Shippen then asked the committee to write down three interest inventory instruments. The results of this vote were tallied with the following chosen: OVIS, COPS, SAGE
The committee then voted on aptitude, with the following results: SAGE, CAPS, ASVAB
Dr. Shippen then thanked the committee for the good work they have done and asked them not to discuss the results of the voting of this committee until he could notify the companies of their decision. As soon as the companies have been notified, he will ask some of the committee to be involved in the decision of school systems, number of students involved, set up preassessment workshops necessary to involve counselors, design instruments by which pilots will be judged, etc.

The next meeting of the committee was set for January 31, 1983, at 9:30 a.m. in the Vocational Conference Room.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

State of Alabama Department of Education
Vocational Education Services

Name of Instrument _____ (Date) _____

RATING FORM FOR ABILITY/ADAPTABILITY ASSESSMENT

Publisher or Vendor _____ (Name of Rator) _____

(Circle one No. for each item)

1.	Predictive validity with an occupational program	Low or not known 1	2	3	4	Very high 5
2.	Predictive validity for entry level employment	Low or not known 1	2	3	4	Very high 5
3.	Predictive validity for any occupational cluster.	Few clusters 1	2	3	4	All clusters 5
4.	Validation procedure	Inappropriate or not known 1	2	3	4	Appropriate 5
5.	Recency of norm data	Out dated 1	2	3	4	Recent 5
6.	Characteristics of normed populations	Different from our target 1	2	3	4	Identical to our target 5
7.	Initial cost per student (including use of norm table)	Very high 1	2	3	4	Very low 5
8.	Continuing cost per student	Very high 1	2	3	4	Very low 5
9.	Readability of inventory (inappropriate)	Very Difficult 1	2	3	4	(appropriate) Very Easy 5
10.	Time needed to administer inventory	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Short 5
11.	Time needed to interpret results to students	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Short 5
12.	Number of persons necessary to administer	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Few 5
13.	Cost for training to administer	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Low 5
14.	Scoring Cost	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Low 5

15. Scoring Convenience	Very inconvenient 1	2	3	4	Very convenient 5
16. Number of students per test administration	Single student 1	2	3	4	Large group 5
17. Reports to the school	Very limited 1	2	3	4	Comprehensive 5
18. Reports to student and parents	None 1	2	3	4	Comprehensive 5

VGS 12/9/82

State of Alabama Department of Education
Vocational Education Services

RATING FORM FOR INTEREST INVENTORY

(Name of Instrument) _____ (Date) _____

(Publisher or Vendor) _____ (Name of Rator) _____

(Circle one number for each item)

1. Predictive validity with an occupational program	Low or not known 1	2	3	4	Very high 5
2. Predictive for any occupational cluster	Few clusters 1	2	3	4	All clusters 5
3. Validation procedure	Inappropriate or not known 1	2	3	4	Appropriate 5
4. Recency of norm data	Out dated 1	2	3	4	Recent 5
5. Characteristics of normed populations	Different from our target 1	2	3	4	Identical to our target 5
6. Initial cost per student	Very high 1	2	3	4	Very low 5
7. Continuing cost per student	Very high 1	2	3	4	Very low 5
8. Readability of inventory (inappropriate)	Very Difficult 1	2	3	4	(appropriate) Very Easy 5
9. Time needed to administer inventory	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Short 5
10. Time needed to interpret results to students	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Short 5
11. Number of persons necessary to administer	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Few 5
12. Cost for training to administer	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Low 5
13. Scoring Cost	Excessive 1	2	3	4	Very Low 5
14. Scoring Convenience	Very inconvenient 1	2	3	4	Very Convenient 5

15. Number of students per test administration	Single student 1	2	3	4	Large group 5
16. Reports to the school	Very limited 1	2	3	4	Comprehensive 5
17. Reports to student and parents	None 1	2	3	4	Comprehensive 5

VGS 12/09/82

REVIEW PANEL RATINGS OF INTEREST INVENTORIES

(1 to 5 with 5 highest)

	60.27 N = 9 COPS	65.74 N = 7 CDM Harrington O'Shea	46.40 N = 5 Project Discovery	53.58 N = 7 MESA	49.61 N = 3 ACT Project Decide	57.04 N = 6 PREP	55.57 N = 6 CAI	57.39 N = 7 OVIS	45.80 N = 5 KUDER	61.95 N = 3 SAGE
1	3.33	3.50	2.20	2.71	2.66	3.83	1.16	2.85	1.60	3.33
2	3.44	4.00	2.60	3.00	2.33	3.83	1.66	3.00	1.60	3.33
3	3.12	3.57	2.60	3.42	3.33	3.33	1.66	3.42	2.00	4.00
4	4.00	4.42	2.60	4.14	3.33	3.80	4.00	4.50	2.60	4.33
5	2.77	3.57	2.60	3.28	3.33	3.66	3.00	3.85	2.60	4.00
6	2.77	3.57	2.40	1.28	2.66	1.66	3.16	2.66	2.40	2.33
7	3.11	3.57	3.00	3.57	2.33	1.66	4.00	2.83	2.20	4.66
8	3.77	3.85	3.20	3.50	3.00	3.80	3.80	3.66	3.40	4.33
9	4.00	4.14	3.40	2.71	3.00	4.00	4.33	2.66	2.40	3.00
10	3.66	3.71	2.60	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.66	3.16	2.40	3.33
11	4.33	4.00	2.60	3.57	3.00	3.83	4.16	3.66	3.20	4.00
12	4.11	4.14	2.80	2.71	3.66	3.83	4.50	3.50	3.60	2.66
13	3.00	3.71	3.20	3.28	2.66	3.33	3.83	2.80	3.00	3.66
14	3.88	3.57	2.80	3.71	2.66	3.66	3.83	3.42	3.20	3.33
15	4.44	4.57	2.80	2.28	3.00	3.66	4.00	3.71	3.40	3.66
16	2.88	4.14	2.80	3.71	3.33	3.33	3.16	4.00	3.20	4.00
17	3.66	3.71	2.20	3.71	2.33	3.33	1.66	3.71	2.80	4.00

RANK ORDER OF REVIEW PANEL
RATING TOTALS ON INTEREST INVENTORIES

1.	CDM Harrington O'Shea	65.74
2.	SAGE	61.95
3.	COPS	60.27
4.	OVIS	57.39
5.	PREP	57.04
6.	CAI	55.57
7.	MESA	53.58
8.	ACT	49.61
9.	Project Discovery	46.40
10.	KUDER	45.80

RANK ORDER OF COSTS FOR INTEREST INVENTORIES

1st.	Project Discovery	$740,422.00
2nd.	MESA	$223,492.50
3rd.	PREP	$60,000.00
4th.	CAI	$25,000.00
5th.	OVIS	$20,673.50
6th.	COPS	$18,500.00
7th.	CDM Harrington O'Shea	$18,000.00
8th.	SAGE	$17,500.00
9th.	KUDER	$15,200.00

[10,000 students
92.40 attendance centers]

REVIEW PANEL RATINGS OF APTITUDE MEASURES

(1 to 5 with 5 highest)

	CAPS	DCAT	Project Discovery	MESA	ACT CPP	DAT	SRA PAC	SAGE
1	3.55	2.00	3.00	3.20	2.25	2.00	2.33	2.80
2	3.33	1.85	3.33	3.60	2.50	2.00	2.33	2.80
3	3.33	2.28	3.33	3.80	3.00	2.57	2.33	2.80
4	3.11	2.42	2.66	3.80	2.50	2.66	2.33	3.40
5	4.00	3.71	3.33	4.20	3.50	4.57	3.33	3.40
6	2.66	2.85	2.66	3.60	3.00	4.28	3.00	3.60
7	2.88	3.28	3.00	1.60	2.25	2.42	2.66	2.00
8	2.88	3.71	3.00	4.20	2.50	2.71	2.66	4.00
9	3.22	3.42	3.33	4.00	3.25	3.71	3.66	3.60
10	4.22	3.71	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.80
11	4.00	3.42	2.33	4.00	3.25	2.57	3.00	3.00
12	4.33	3.71	3.33	4.80	3.50	3.42	3.66	3.40
13	3.77	3.71	2.66	3.80	4.00	3.57	3.33	2.40
14	3.00	3.14	2.66	4.40	3.25	3.16	3.00	4.20
15	3.66	3.28	2.66	4.20	4.25	3.42	3.66	3.60
16	3.66	3.71	2.66	3.20	3.75	4.00	4.66	2.60
17	2.55	3.14	2.66	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.60
18	3.66	2.57	2.00	3.60	3.25	4.00	4.00	3.60
	N = 9	N = 7	N = 3	N = 5	N = 4	N = 7	N = 3	N = 5
TOTAL SCORE	61.81	55.91	57.60	67.00	57.00	57.06	41.69	57.60

RANK ORDER OF REVIEW PANEL
RATING TOTALS ON APTITUDE MEASURES

1.	MESA	67.00
2.	CAPS	61.81
3.	SAGE	57.60
3.	Project Discovery	57.60
5.	DAT	57.06
6.	CPP ACT	57.00
7.	DCAT	55.91
8.	PAC SRA	41.69

RANK ORDER OF COSTS FOR
APTITUDE MEASURES

1st.	Project Discovery	$740,422.00
2nd.	MESA	$223,492.00
3rd.	SAGE	$50,250.00
4th.	DAT	$26,293.00
5th.	DECAT	$25,700.00
6th.	ACT	$16,250.00
7th.	CAPS	$12,700.00

[10,000 students
92.40 attendance centers]

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
PILOT ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Instruments	Number of Tenth-Grade Students	SDE Personnel	Number of Ninth-Grade Students	Sites
CAPS		Hilda Wright	79	Lexington School (Lauderdale Co.)
		Hilda Wright	69	Addison High School (Winston Co.)
	40	Sandra Yelverton		J. U. Blacksher School (Monroe Co.)
	179	Sandra Yelverton	173	McIntyre Jr. High (Montgomery Co.)
		Troy Newton	157	Bullock County (Bullock Co.)
COPS		Sam Shippen	430	W.P. Davidson H.S. (Mobile Co.)
		Sam Shippen	48	Sweetwater H.S. (Marengo Co.)
		Troy Newton	52	Clay County H.S. (Clay Co.)
SAGE Interest		James Harris	48	Marion Co. H.S. (Marion Co.)
		James Harris	227	Northport Jr. H.S. (Tuscaloosa Co.)
		James Harris	148	Mortimer Jordan H.S. (Jefferson Co.)
		Henry Wright	35	Calhoun High School (Lowndes Co.)
		Henry Wright	59	New Brocton H.S. (Coffee Co.)
SAGE Aptitude	59	Wondal Whitt		Crossville H.S. (DeKalb Co.)
		Jim Pratt	53	Lipscomb Jr. H.S. (Jefferson Co.)
		Wondal Whitt	350	Albertville H.S. (Marshall Co.)
		Jim Pratt	85	Daleville H.S. (Daleville City)
OVIS		Bennie Hayes	31	Meek High School (Winston Co.)
		Bennie Hayes	109	Carbon Hill H.S. (Carbon Hill City)
		Bennie Hayes	173	McAdory H.S. (Jefferson Co.)
		Kay Johnson	58	Coosa County H.S. (Coosa Co.)
		Kay Johnson	91	West Blocton H.S. (Bibb Co.)
		Ralph Johnson	49	Autaugaville H.S. (Autauga Co.)
		Ralph Johnson	25	Banks Jr. H.S. (Pike Co.)
ASVAB		Ann Smith	228	Thompson H.S. (Shelby Co.)
	213	Ann Smith		Stanhope Elmore H.S. (Elmore Co.)
	99	Lavord Crook		Livingston H.S. (Sumter Co.)

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Appendix C

STUDENT REACTION FORM

Name of Test _____ School _____

Place a check over the answer which best describes your opinion.

1. Were the instructions given before the test started clear and helpful to you?

Completely Mostly Somewhat Not at all

2. Did you understand the wording in the questions?

Completely In Nearly All Questions In Most Questions Only In Some Questions

3. Did you have difficulty answering the questions or following the directions?

Very Much Some Very Little Not At All

4. How many questions did you not understand?

Most of Them Some Very Few None Of Them

5. Do you think this test will help you in choosing high school courses?

Very Helpful Some Help Little Help No Help

6. Would this test be helpful to other ninth/tenth grade students?

(Only 9th Graders Respond) Yes, All Ninth Graders Yes, Most Ninth Graders Only Few Not Any

(Only 10th Graders Respond) Yes, All Tenth Graders Yes, Most Tenth Graders Only Few Not Any

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT

TEST INTERPRETOR (After Interpretation)

Name of Test _____ School _____ Date: Interpretation Completed _____

1. What per cent of students who took the test received a data report? _____%

2. What per cent of students who took the test received an interpretation of the data?

_____%

3. How many students received an intrepretation of their results? _____

4. Did students receive a report and explanation they could take home? _____ Yes _____ No

(Check One Under Each Question)

5. To what extent did the test results lend themselves to group interpretations?

Very appropriate for group interpretations	Most interpretations could be in groups	Most interpretations could not be in groups	Group interpretations not appropriate

6. How were test results made available for inclusion in permanent school records?

Special report provided	Copy of student report provided	Copy could be made	No record report available

7. Are other materials needed to make the test interpretations useful?

Not at all	Only in special cases	In most cases	In all cases

8. How valuable are these test results for program planning and enrollment projections?

Of great value	Of some value	Of little value	Of no value

9. How useful will these results be for vocational teachers and administrators?

Of great value	Of some value	Of little value	Of no value

10. How does this test compare with other interest or aptitude tests you have administered?

Is not as good	Is about equal	Is better	No basis for comparison

11. How many total hours were spent in interpreting the results? _____ hrs.

Form VGS 3/22/83

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT

TEST ADMINISTRATOR (AFTER TESTING)

_____ _____
Name of Test School

(Check One Under Each Question)

1. How difficult was it for you to learn to give this test?

Very Difficult Difficult Easy Very Easy

2. How many hours did you spend in the following:

Training Session _____ hrs.

Practice _____ hrs.

Preparing materials for students _____ hrs.

Administering the Test _____ hrs. for _____ total students.

3. Were you comfortable with the directions and information you were able to give students?

Very Comfortable Comfortable Uncomfortable Very Uncomfortable

4. Do you believe the students understood the questions?

Yes, all of them Most of them Many of them Few of them

5. The number of students to whom you could administer the test at one time was:

0 - 15 16 - 30 31 - 45 46 - 100 101 plus

6. Is this test feasible for use in your local school system as administered in the pilot?

Very Feasible Feasible Feasible with Modification Not Feasible

7. How easy was this test to administer?

Very Difficult Difficult Easy Very Easy

8. Was it difficult to distribute, collect and package these materials?

Very Difficult Difficult Easy Very Easy

Form V[illegible] 2/83

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COPS*
SAGE**
OVIS***

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT

SCATTERGRAM OF REACTIONS TO INTEREST SURVEYS BY STUDENTS

Name of Test _____ School _____

Place a check over the answer which best describes your opinion.

1. Were the instructions given before the test started clear and helpful to you?

Completely | Mostly | Somewhat * | ** *** Not at all

1.308 COPS
1.667 SAGE
1.618 OVIS

2. Did you understand the wording in the questions?

Completely | In Nearly All Questions | In Most Questions** * *** | Only In Some Questions

1.623 COPS
1.768 SAGE
1.924 OVIS

3. Did you have difficulty answering the questions or following the directions?

Very Much | Some | Very Little * ** *** | Not At All

(Reversed Scale)

1.594 COPS
1.625 SACE
1.831 OVIS

4. How many questions did you not understand?

Most of Them *** | Some * | Very Few ** | None Of Them

(Reversed Scale)

2.509 COPS
1.810 SAGE
3.997 OVIS

5. Do you think this test will help you in choosing high school courses?

Very Helpful | Some Help * | ** Little Help *** | No Help

2.528 COPS
2.282 SAGE
1.960 OVIS

6. Would this test be helpful to other ninth/tenth grade students?

COMBINED DATA FOR ANALYSIS

(Only 9th Graders Respond) | Yes, All Ninth Graders | Yes, Most * Ninth Graders ** | **Only Few | Not Any

3.136 COPS
2.662 SAGE
2.36 OVIS

(Only 10th Graders Respond) | Yes, All Tenth Graders | Yes, Most Tenth Graders | Only Few | Not Any

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES
VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROJECT

SCATTERGRAM OF REACTIONS TO APTITUDE SURVEYS BY STUDENTS

CAPS*
SAGE**
ASVAB***

Name of Test _____ School _____

Place a check over the answer which best describes your opinion.

1. Were the instructions given before the test started clear and helpful to you?

Completely	Mostly	Somewhat ***	Not at all

1.947 CAPS
1.428 SAGE
1.813 ASVAB

2. Did you understand the wording in the questions?

Completely	In Nearly All Questions **	In Most Questions	Only In Some Questions

2.826 CAPS
1.656 SAGE
2.722 ASVAB

3. Did you have difficulty answering the questions or following the directions?

Very Much	Some ***	Very Little *	Not At All

(Reversed Scale)

2.644 CAPS
2.131 SAGE
3.079 ASVAB

4. How many questions did you not understand?

Most of Them	Some **	Very Few ***	None Of Them

(Reversed Scale)

2.644 CAPS
1.997 SAGE
2.667 ASVAB

5. Do you think this test will help you in choosing high school courses?

Very Helpful	Some Help ***	Little Help **	No Help

3.109 CAPS
2.207 SAGE
2.39 ASVAB

6. Would this test be helpful to other ninth/tenth grade students?

Combined Data for analysis

(Only 9th Graders Respond)	Yes, All Ninth Graders	Yes, Most Ninth Graders **	Only Few **	Not Any	_____ CAPS 2.791 SAGE 2.649 ASVAB
(Only 10th Graders Respond)	Yes, All Tenth Graders	Yes, Most Tenth Graders	Only Few	Not Any	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT: Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS)
DATE: June 21-22, 1983
RECORDER: Dorothy White

Strengths:

1. Easy to administer - Visuals were very good and easy to understand. Directions or instructions were simple and anyone with a small amount of training can administer test.
2. Each test was on one page and directions were easy to follow.
3. The actual testing time is forty minutes, and you have much useful and helpful information.
4. Valuable information for students, classroom teachers and all counselors.
5. Test can be administered to a small or large group.
6. Students were positive as far as taking the test.
7. Takes a short time to interpret the results to students. Interpretation can be done in a group very well.
8. Features good suggestions. Lots of extra-curricular materials and suggested schedule for the students.
9. Excellent for career planning in grades nine through twelve.
10. Supports counselor suggestions; reinforces counseling advice.
11. Correlates with other aptitude test.
12. Results were back in about three weeks.
13. Color codes for interpretation. Students can see results easily, and most of them did well in at least one area.
14. The systems that administered this test recommend it highly.

CAPS continued...

Weaknesses:

1. Needed more than one printout: one to file in records and one for the student.
2. Needs first name and last name instead of initial and last name.
3. If test is marked "invalid", give reason.

REPORT: SAGE Aptitude/Interest
DATE: June 21-22, 1983
RECORDER: Wondal Whitt

Strengths:

1. Students verbally indicated that they enjoyed the test.
2. Measures eleven aptitudes.
3. Test can be given successfully to small, as well as, large groups.
4. Test is designed for any age group.

Weaknesses:

1. The merits of the test are not questionable, though the results seemingly will be more difficult and time consuming to interpret than with some other tests. SAGE is basically designed for in-house scoring.
2. Combined test booklets would expedite the process.
3. Coding the answer sheets was very time consuming.
4. Instructions were deviated throughout entire test.
5. Individual data on students must be modified for computer printout.
6. Test results need individual printout for each student.
7. Information received from company, i.e., test results, was not understandable.
8. Turn-around time was not within standards of pilot.

REPORT: ASVAB
DATE: June 21-22, 1983
RECORDER: Ann Smith

Strengths of ASVAB:

1. Speedy return on the results ___ computer printout
2. Orientation with ninth graders was good.
3. Test should be administered in the Fall.
4. Pre-activities were good - "Your Future is Now."
5. Works well with prevocational
6. Results booklets were excellent, "Understanding Your Scores."
7. Video with activities helped.
8. The counselors taking the test and receiving test results was good.
9. Counselor taking test helped explain percentiles population comparison.

Weaknesses:

1. Printed comparison did not come as was requested.
2. Time of year was bad.
3. It was the same test as was given to eleventh graders for military entrance.
4. Too male oriented and military

Recommendations:

1. Have enough occupational outlook handbooks for children to research test results.
2. Prepare youngsters to research resource manuals.
3. Utilize "Your Future is Now" and "Understanding Your Scores".
4. Secure for each school 50 copies of the Occupational Outlook Handbook.

REPORT: Career Occupational Preference Survey (COPS)
DATE: June 21-22, 1983
RECORDER: Vera Harris

Strengths:

1. The test was easy to administer.
2. The amount of time required to administer the test was
3. It was easy to administer to a large group.
4. The test interpretation was easily provided for a large group.

*

Weaknesses:

1. It provided no summary report.
2. The individual report lacked personal information.
3. The material lacked quality.
4. The validity of test was questionable due to the amount of time.
5. The reading level of the test was somewhat advanced for some ninth graders.
6. It provided only one copy of test results for each student.

* This test was helpful in providing useful information to the students. I would like to have the COPS used along with the CAPS. The two together can provide valuable information in long-range planning.

REPORT: OVIS II
DATE: June 21-22, 1983
RECORDER: Martha B. Vines

Strengths:

1. The Psychological Corporation was extremely helpful. Their personnel maintained continuous communication with the persons who were to administer the survey.
2. The materials provided for both pre- and post-assessment were plentiful and excellent.
3. The students liked the survey, except for the ones who wouldn't like anything they have to do.
4. The survey was fairly easy to administer; anyone familiar with standardized grids and tests would have no difficulty.
5. The score reports of the survey were returned as promptly as the corporation could do it. They at least were returned before the closing of school.
6. The score reports returned were outstanding. Not only did we receive two reports for each student surveyed, but also a Group Guidance Report. and a lot of information that will be invaluable in setting up groups for group guidance.
7. The OVIS II is correlated and cross-referenced with the DOT, The Occupational Outlook Handbook, the Alabama Occupational Information Service, College-Major Index and the Worker-Trait Group Index.

Weaknesses:

1. The survey took quite a bit of time, although the group felt that it would not be too much time if the process could be stretched out over a school year.

OVIS II continued...

2. Some of the slower readers and poorer readers may have had some difficulty with the length of the survey and some of terminology.
3. The survey results may be a little difficult for the students to understand.
4. Some of the group felt that the survey might be above the level of some students in the ninth grade, especially the slow learners or Special Education students.

Overall the group liked the OVIS II.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION
1372 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E., ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30367 (404)892-3700

June 3, 1983

Dr. Samuel J. Shippen
State Specialist
Vocational Guidance and Counseling
Division of Vocational Education Services
State Department of Education
812 State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36103

Dear Sam:

I have checked with Dr. Herman on the Jefferson County study with D.A.T. Some of the data submitted is suspect and the project person is in the process of contacting Ms. Fadeley for clarification. Also Dr. Herman and his staff have been rushing to complete the new Technical Manual for the new D.A.T. which should be completed within a week.

He (Dr. Herman) apologizes for the delay but he also has another problem and that is the Corporation's move to Middleburg Heights (Cleveland) Ohio during the middle of next month. Consequently, we (Dr. Herman and I) ask for a little more patience on your part and we will complete the study.

Concerning the OVIS II Pilot, I have attached a schedule of critical dates concerning shipment of the OVIS II documents for scoring. What pleases me the most, is the basic student report was only in-house for 11 working days, while the original estimated turn-around time was 15 days.

Due to the nature of the pilot program, the generation of the summary data did, indeed, take a few days longer than is normal. However, in the future, this will be the exception and not the rule. Also, if OVIS II is selected, the shipping delays from Montgomery to our scoring center can easily be reduced with careful coordination and selection of a carrier.

I trust this information will be helpful and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Wathen
Manager, Southeastern Region

cc: Alvin Parker

HARCOURT BRACE JOVANOVICH, PUBLISHERS

DATE	ACTION	# DAYS
4/22/83	Completed OVIS II documents shipped to S.E.Regional office, The Psychological Corporation from AL/SDE	N/A
4/25/83	Documents received from AL/SDE at S.E. Regional office	4
4/25/83	Documents shipped from S.E.Regional Office to The Psychological Corporation Scoring Center in Iowa City, Iowa	N/A
4/29/83	Documents received at scoring center in Iowa City	4
5/16/83	Basic Student Report OVIS II shipped from the scoring center	11 (working days)
5/17/83	Basic Student Report OVIS II received at AL/SDE (4:00PM CDST)	1

ASVAB will provide for the State Testing Section an accumulative report on all students tested by percentile, by school system, by school and by student in alphabetical order. All scoring will be performed locally for the State.

By September 1985 there will be a manual disseminated by the military which crosswalks the military and civilian jobs and utilizes the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

EdITS
P.O. Box 7234
San Diego, California 92107
Editorial Office:
(619) 488-1666
Order Department:
(619) 222-1666

June 8, 1983

Dr. Samuel J. Shippen, State Specialist
Vocational Guidance and Counseling
Alabama State Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education Services
812 State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Dear Dr. Shippen:

In response to your request concerning summaries on the COPSystem Instruments (COPS, CAPS, COPES), the following information is submitted:

1. Individual student data is available in a self-scoring format on each instrument and also in a machine-scoring format in printout. Please see a sample of the machine-scoring format as submitted. Both machine-scoring format printout and student-scoring formats are combined for interpretation in the comprehensive profile and guide.

2. The cost for providing summary data on a school basis will consist of .20¢ per student with a total minimum number of 100 students. This service must be requested at the time the testing is purchased because it is a supplementary service and the data is not stored in the computer unless requested by users at the time of scoring.

3. Summaries by County or Regional Intermediate area, i.e., sub-district within a large school district or counties within a state, cost .20¢ per student computed on a minimum of 100 students.

4. Statewide summaries are available at a cost of .20¢ per student computed on a minimum of 100 students. Statewide summaries must be requested at the time of purchase and initial scoring because they are not stored in the computer for use at a later date.

5. Enclosed are copies of summaries that have been customized and provided for other districts, state department of education, and sub-units, i.e., counties. A similar customized printing would be developed for the State of Alabama if you adopt the COPSystem and its component instruments.

EdITS
P.O. Box 7234
San Diego, California 92107
Editorial Office:
(619) 488-1666
Order Department:
(619) 222-1666

6. I trust this information is helpful to you and answers all the questions that you have concerning the COPSystem. Should you have any additional questions, please call me at (619) 462-9710.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Jacobson

Thomas J. Jacobson, Ph.D.
Consulting Senior Research Scientist

TJJ/mw

cc: Samples of printouts on summary data on COPSystem

65

Dr Shyman

57

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION
1372 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E., ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30367 (404)892-3700

April 7, 1982

Dr. Robert Carter
Director of Vocational Education
Alabama State Department of Education
State Office Building - Room 887
Montgomery, AL 36103

Dear Dr. Carter:

We are pleased to submit the attached cost estimate for the new OHIO VOCATIONAL INTEREST SURVEY, Second Edition (OVIS II).

Our estimate is based on the following specifications given to Alvin Parker, Field Representative for the state of Alabama, during his last visit with you.

Survey Specifications

Projected Enrollment 61,000

Materials:
Re-usable Testbooklets
Machine-scorable answer sheets (MRC)
Scoring Service:
Basic Service

The estimated cost for this project is attached for your consideration (Enclosure # 1).

With respect to the terms, I believe they are self-explanatory except to emphasize that this cost places the burden of distribution and collection on the State Department of Education. Consequently, our reduced distribution costs are passed on to the Department.

If, however, the Department wishes to involve my company in any or all phases of the distribution and collection, this will drive up the per pupil cost. Therefore, anticipating your question of "how much more per pupil will it cost?" it all depends on a mutually agreed upon revised set of specifications.

Since I have introduced the issue of possible cost increase, I feel I would be remiss if I did not mention, in detail, additional OVIS II summary services and interpretive materials that were briefly reviewed by Mr. Parker during his last visit with you. I believe these additional services and materials are worthy of consideration

HARCOURT BRACE JOVANOVICH, PUBLISHERS

since they will greatly expand the proposed program while being very cost-effective.

Therefore, please allow me to review the additional services and materials and briefly indicate the enhanced benefits.

SCORING SERVICES (Re: Enclosure # 2 - OVIS II sampler)

Group Guidance Summary - pages 20-21
Organizational information for group and individual counseling at the school level.

Career Planning Questionnaire - pages 22-23
Summary data can be developed by school, system and state.

Local Survey - pages 22-23
Any combination of local and/or state-wide questions can be developed based on your need for information. (See Enclosures # 3 and 5 for examples of local survey questions.) Summary data can be developed by school, system and state.

Cost (based on current specifications)

Group Guidance Summary	$ .12/student
Career Planning Questionnaire	.15/student
Local Survey	.15/student

Increased benefits:

School Level -
The addition of summary data will greatly assist the Vocational Counselor, the School Counselor and the Career Educator to more effectively organize their students for group and individual interpretation of scores, exploration and individual student program planning.

State Level-
The addition of summary data will provide a valuable new dimension to state-wide educational research and industrial development.

State and Local Level
The addition of summary data can address virtually any issue connected with local and state-wide needs assessment.

MATERIALS FOR INTERPRETING AND EXPLORATION (Re: Enclosure # 2)

Sound filmstrip - "Your Interests" - page 3
Sound filmstrip - "Interpreting OVIS II" - page 18
Handbook for Exploration Careers - pages 14-17
Manual for Interpreting (OVIS II) - page 18

Student Career Planner (Enclosure # 4)

Cost of materials:

All materials, except the consumable "Student Career Planner", are a one-time purchase. Consequently, the initial expenditure spread over the life of the pro-program is cost-effective. Furthermore, the cost of these materials can be quoted for a discounted price on a quantity purchase.

Increased Benefits:

School Level-

Easily implemented materials that will provide Vocational Counselors, School Counselors, and Career Educators with a flexible vehicle to fulfill their respective system goals. In addition the student will be guided through a five step program in which she/he will incorporate their interests, aptitudes and academic performance into a realistic, workable secondary and post-secondary educational plan.

State Level-

Providing a uniform program that is cost-effective and if properly implemented and supervised, will insure the attainment of the relative state goals for Vocational Educators, Academic Educators and Career Educators.

Dr. Carter, please forgive me for digressing beyond your original request, but I truly felt that the full impact of OVIS II and the capabilities of our scoring service had to be fully presented to you. My 16 years of service with the Psychological Corporation and my personal involvement with both editions of OVIS provides me with the confidence to say that OVIS II can provide the program vehicle to satisfy the majority of the student program planning needs for Vocational, Academic and Career Education in the state of Alabama.

If you desire clarification of any points connected with the Cost Estimate, please do not hesitate to contact me at (404) 892-3700 or Mr. Parker (205) 383-8745.

I look forward to meeting you during the "Symposium: From Learning to Earning," in Birmingham, April 27-29, 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Wathen
Manager, Southeastern Region

RLW/nb

c.c. Eldon Johnson
Anita Barber
Alvin Parker

Enclosures - 5

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION
757 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017 (212) 888-3500 CABLE: HARBRACE

Alabama State Department of Education

Office of Vocational Education

Special Program Proposal

Ohio Vocational Interest Survey, Second Edition

Materials	
Reusable Test Booklet	$ .459/bklt
Machine-Scorable Answer Sheet (MRC)	.229/bklt

Scoring Service	Per Pupil
Basic Service	$ 1.25

The foregoing prices pertain only to this Special Program Proposal for test materials and scoring services and cannot be held to apply for purchase of test materials only. The prices quoted herein are based on the assumption that the materials and scoring services will be purchased in 1982, and that all answer documents will be sent for processing in one single shipment, with reports returned to one single address. Prices for materials are quoted at a 15½% discount, which is applicable to programs of similar size. Costs for transportation and postage are not included in prices quoted, which are valid for ninety days. Prices are FOB shipping point, plus a charge equal to lowest insurance rate listed by carrier for our guarantee fo a delivery, unless customer specifically requests otherwise.

April 1, 1982

Ann F. Rowland
Manager, Scoring Operations
Data Services Division

Encl - 1

SAGE - J.O.B.S.
EVALUATION-TRAINING MATERIALS

21 PAULDING STREET
PLEASANTVILLE N.Y. 10570

800-431-2016
IN N.Y. 914-769-4266

PESCO

July 25, 1983

Mr. Samuel J. Shippen
State Specialist Room 812
Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg.
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Dear Mr. Shippen:

I have enclosed a copy of the Alabama computer scoring for the feasibility study. These have been listed by school. It is recommended that the print out show ranking by G (Intelligence) in descending order. Level 1 highest down to level 5 lowest.

The print out would also provide a listing of recommended vocational programs based on Interest, Aptitudes and Grade Level Functioning. The cost for this, if PESCO were to provide this service, would be $2.00 per student with a minimum amount of students for each run.

A computer program for use by the State can also be developed to provide a State in-house scoring and matching print out. You will find a copy of a print out from Salem Voc. Tech. School which has the students in vo-tech programs listed in descending order of Reasoning, Math and Language including disabilities and ratings of achievement based on information from instructors.

I hope this provides sufficient information to meet your needs.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Kass

CHARLES L. KASS
Vice-President

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alabama Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Thirteenth Annual Report 1982, Auburn, Alabama.

State of Alabama, Alabama Accountability Report for Vocational Education, Fiscal Year 1981-82, State of Alabama, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education Services, Montgomery, Alabama.

State of Alabama, Alabama Vocational Education Standards and Policies for Quality Programs in Secondary Schools, 1981 Revision of Bulletin 1978, No. 25; State of Alabama, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Services, Montgomery, Alabama.

State of Alabama, Vocational Guidance and Counseling Survey, V.G.S., 7/30/82 Unpublished Survey, State of Alabama, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education Services, Vocational Guidance Services, Montgomery, Alabama.

Department of Education - NCES, Alabama Secondary Program Enrollment and Completion Report Occupational Preparation Programs Involving VEDS Follow-Up Activities, Department of Education -NCES, Washington, D.C., Vocational Education Data System, July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982.